

KBR:kbr 01/04/08 820301 300305.02  
PATENTAttorney Reference Number 3382-65017-01  
Application Number 10/644,258

### Remarks

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. In the present amendment, claims 36, 75, 79, 96 and 101-104 have been amended, as described below. The Applicants have canceled claims 62-64 and 80-82 without prejudice. Claims 1-35, 37, 38 and 42-61 were previously canceled without prejudice.

In the final Office action, the Examiner rejects claims 36, 39-41, 62, 63, 65-76, 78-81, 83-97 and 99-104 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,821,986 to Yuan et al. ("the Yuan patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,300,949 to Rodriguez et al. ("the Rodriguez patent"). Final Office action, pages 2-6. The Examiner rejects claims 77 and 98 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Yuan patent in view of the Rodriguez patent and U.S. Patent No. 6,937,291 to Gryskiewicz. Final Office action, page 6. The Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections but have amended the claims to expedite prosecution.

In the final Office action, the Examiner indicates dependent claims 64 and 82 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Final Office action, page 6.

#### Independent Claim 36

The Applicants have moved the language of objected-to claim 64 (and intermediate dependent claim 63) up to claim 36.

The Applicants have made minor editorial revisions to the language of claim 36. In particular, the Applicants have added the phrase "wherein each of the at least one P-frame has a reference I-frame among the at least one I-frame" to claim 36. The Applicants have also made adjustments to the language from claim 64 to integrate the added phrase. The Applicants have also changed the phrase "if the first information ..." to "determining the first information...."

Claim 36 should be allowable.

#### Independent Claim 79

The Applicants have moved the language of objected-to claim 82 (and intermediate dependent claim 81) up to claim 79. The Applicants have also made minor editorial additions and revisions.

Claim 79 should be allowable.

KBR:kbr 01/04/08 820301 300305.02  
PATENTAttorney Reference Number 3382-65017-01  
Application Number 10/644,258Independent Claims 101-104

The Applicants have added language from objected-to claims 64 and 82 to each of independent claims 101-104, respectively, and made minor editorial additions and revisions. Claims 101-104 should be allowable.

Dependent Claims 75 and 96

The Applicants have made minor editorial revisions to dependent claims 75 and 96 to reflect changes made to their respective parent claims.

Conclusion

Claims 36, 39-41, 65-79 and 83-104 should be allowable. Such action is respectfully requested.

If any issues remain, the Examiner is formally requested to contact the undersigned attorney prior to issuance of the next Office Action in order to arrange a telephonic interview. It is believed that a brief discussion of the merits of the present application may expedite prosecution. Applicants submit the foregoing formal Amendment so that the Examiner may fully evaluate Applicants' position, thereby enabling the interview to be more focused. This request is being submitted under MPEP § 713.01, which indicates that an interview may be arranged in advance by a written request.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600  
121 S.W. Salmon Street  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: (503) 595-5300  
Facsimile: (503) 595-5301

By

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kyle B. Rinehart  
Registration No. 47,027